

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Carson City District Office

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

Project Lead: Perry Wickham

Field Office: Sierra Front

Lead Office: Sierra Front

Case File/Project Number: NVN 062839

Applicable Categorical Exclusion (cite section): 516 DM 11.9, Appendix 4, E. (13):

Amendments to existing rights-of-way, such as upgrading of existing facilities, which entail no additional disturbances outside of the right-of-way boundary.

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2014-0031-CX

Project Name: AT&T Fiber Optic ROW Amendment

Project Description: AT&T proposes to place a fiber optic cable on existing poles within their existing authorized right-of-way (ROW) (NVN 062839) located in T. 16 N., R. 21 E., Section 25, N1/2NE1/4NW1/4, Lyon County, Nevada, for the purpose of providing advanced telecommunications service to a cell site. The existing ROW NVN 062839 is 1,332.72 feet long and 20 feet wide. This amendment would coincide with the existing ROW in terms of service, expiring on February 3, 2029. This cable would be used on a continuous basis to provide telecommunication services to said cell site. The construction timetable for completion is contingent upon this amendment and it is anticipated to take 1-2 days to complete construction of the new fiber optic cable. There will be no need for any additional work areas outside the existing ROW grant.

Does the project include new surface disturbing activities? ☐Yes ☒No

Is the project located within preliminary general habitat for sage-grouse? ☐Yes ☒No

Is the project located within preliminary priority habitat for sage-grouse? ☐Yes ☒No

Is the project located within proposed critical habitat for bi-state sage-grouse? ☐Yes ☒No

Is the project located within critical habitat for Webber's Ivesia? ☐Yes ☒No

Applicant Name: Nevada Bell, d/b/a AT&T Nevada

Project Location (include Township/Range, County): T. 16 N., R. 21 E., Section 25, N1/2NE1/4NW1/4, Lyon County, Nevada

BLM Acres for the Project Area: 0.61 acres

Land Use Plan Conformance (cite reference/page number): This action is in conformance with the Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan (2001): Lands and

Realty, page LND-7 (6): "Exchanges and minor non-Bureau initiated proposals will be considered where analysis indicates they are beneficial to the public."

Name of Plan: NV – Carson City RMP.

Screening of Extraordinary Circumstances: The following extraordinary circumstances apply to individual actions within categorical exclusions (43 CFR 46.215). The BLM has considered the following criteria:

| <i>If any question is answered 'yes' an EA or EIS must be prepared.</i> | YES | NO |
|--|------------|-----------|
| 1. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on public health or safety? | | X |
| 2. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (EO 11990); floodplains (EO 11988); national monuments; migratory birds (EO 13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas? | | X |
| 3. Would the Proposed Action have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA 102(2)(E)]? | | X |
| 4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? | | X |
| 5. Would the Proposed Action establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects? | | X |
| 6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? | | X |
| 7. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the NRHP as determined by the bureau or office? | | X |
| 8. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the list of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species? | | X |
| 9. Would the Proposed Action violate federal law, or a State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment? | | X |
| 10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? | | X |
| 11. Would the Proposed Action limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 13007)? | | X |
| 12. Would the Proposed Action contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and EO 13112)? | | X |

CONCLUSION: Based upon the review of this Proposed Action, I have determined that the above-described project is a categorical exclusion, in conformance with the LUP, and does not require an EA or EIS.

Approved by:

ACTIVE FOR


Leon Thomas
Field Manager
Sierra Front Field Office

8/5/2014

(date)

Does this CX constitute the decision document for this Proposed Action? ☐ Yes ☒ No